UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,865	09/22/2003	Charles Le Gall	Q77525	4308
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 01/20/201 ON. PLLC	EXAMINER		
	LVANIA AVENUE, N	MILLER, SAMANTHA A		
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20037	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,	3749		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/20/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/664,865	LE GALL, CHARLES	
Examiner	Art Unit	

SA	MANTHA A. MILLER	3749	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>15 December 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION F	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the application, applicant must timely file one of the following replication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (v for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR periods:	same day as filing a Notice of es: (1) an amendment, affidav vith appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar it, or other evidence, we with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the billion The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisor no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). Of MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	ory Action, or (2) the date set forth nan SIX MONTHS from the mailir	ng date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on will have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorteset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on and the corresponding amount ened statutory period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliant filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within AMENDMENTS 	thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but p (a) They raise new issues that would require further conside (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better for appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corre	eration and/or search (see NO	TE below); educing or simplifying th	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. S 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowan non-allowable claim(s).	<u></u> .		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) very how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-17. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		ill be entered and an ex	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but bef because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and suf was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	ficient reasons why the affidat	vit or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a No entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overc showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and	ome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does 		·	
See Continuation Sheet. 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTC 13. ☐ Other:	0/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Kenneth B Rinehart/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3743	/Samantha A Miller/ Examiner, Art Unit 3749)	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The proposed amendment is not entered because it would be new matter since the original application does not specify state what the second sub-wall is formed from and the 112 enablement rejection would not change. Applicant contends that the 112 rejection of adding new matter should withdrawn for the limitation "said first space and said second space are without any ribs therein" because no ribs are shown in Figure 1 of applicants drawings. However, this is a negative limitation which needs to be stated in the original specification and the specification does not mention the enclosure can not have ribs or even mention ribs making this limitation new matter. Applicant contends that BRETSCHNEIDER does not teach not having ribs. Though this is also rejected as new matter BRETSCHNEIDER teaches the use of ribs, but also teaches the use of webs as ribs (ex. col.5 II.31-40) which would meet this limitation. Webs are not ribs when using webs BRETSCHNEIDER teaches a rib free system. Applicant contends that BRETSCHNEIDER does not teach at least a portion of said air circulator device is installed substantially in said second outside opening. Claim 5 states; a portion of said air circulator device BRETSCHNEIDER teaches a portion of (35) is installed substantially in said second outside opening which I am considering the openings surrounding 35 to 36 since the lamellas connect 35 to ambient air are considered the outside openings. The rejection of claims 1-17 is deemed proper.